

called to order for his presumption he replies with a sneer, "Yea, hath God said?"—"O my soul, COME NOT THOU INTO THEIR SECRET; unto their Assembly, mine honour, BE NOT THOU UNITED."

We frequently hear mention of the *moral government of God*, but in such a loose, indefinite, graspless manner, that one might as well go in search of that *invisible church* which is composed of *visible men* who never saw or heard of each other, (and which has been the subject of much grave speculation,) as to attempt to ascertain what this government is, or where it is to be found. Now a government which has for its object the control of the conduct of *visible men*, without a *visible administration* and a *known system of law*, must be as inscrutable and as useless among mankind as an *invisible church*. If He gives us a moral government, He must also give us a *visible administration* to superintend our *visible conduct*, or it can be of but little use. We are creatures of *sense*; yea our *bodily senses* inform us of every thing we know, and carry home to the mind every particle of information we obtain. It is evidently congenial to the first principles of our nature to pay divine worship to an *object of the senses*: in which, when "we shall see Him as He is," we shall be fully gratified without the danger of idolatry, and even as a preservative against it. But where shall we look for this *visible administration* of the Divine law? Where but to "the Church of the living God"—"the pillar and ground of the truth"—"the kingdom of Christ"—"the mother of us all?"

But is this administration appointed to take cognizance of all the visible actions of men? Certainly, or it cannot be a *government*: and it should possess the essentials of a system combining the power of *persuasion and instruction*, and of *force and restraint*, adequate to any emergencies, as well as adapted to a state of peace:—"the sword of the spirit which is the word of God" in the hand of one department of state: and the *civil sword* warranted by the same word, in the hands of another. These as we shall presently see, are both of them *God's ministers*, for *God's purposes*. The civil power may therefore, as we know it was "in Israel," safely be assumed as a *necessary part* of the moral government of God; namely of his Church: For without the civil sword to restrain crime and ward off external aggression, no society can exist in the world, and consequently no government. Neither can there be government without religion, or *allegiance*, as the word religion properly signifies. And as the civil sword is for the protection of the good and the restraint of the wicked, the king is necessarily *temporal head* of the Church: "for he is the *minister of God to thee for good*"—namely for religious purposes. "But if thou do that which is evil, be afraid; for he beareth not the sword in vain: for he is the *minister of God*, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil." But whether is this *minister of God* appointed for moral purposes—for moral government or not? For moral good undoubtedly. It was also for moral reasons that he said: "He that despiseth you despiseth me; and he that despiseth me despiseth him that sent me." How can a Church exist where there is no government, or a government where there is no Church? The Church and the civil state are but two essential parts of the same thing, the *moral government of God*. Either without the other is imperfect, like unmarried persons, destitute of that mutual support which, in a state of union, each is calculated to give to the other. Thus the Jewish religious code was the civil statute book, and their statute book contained their faith; and the king as well as the priest, was the LORD'S ANOINTED. Their religion towards God was their proper allegiance to the government. They could not be pious without honoring "the king as SUPREME,"—as God's minister and head of the Church. Thus David was anointed with holy oil "to feed my people Israel" as he had fed the flock of his father.

Christianity is as capable of such a condition as was Judaism; and a Christian people, as God's covenant people, as strictly need a Christian King to feed them as David fed Israel, as did the house of Jacob. The kings of Israel were anointed and crowned by the priests: so are the kings of England. They were obliged to understand the national law: so should a king of England, that he may fulfil his coronation oath in maintaining to the best of his power the Church of God. And thus being made a *servant of the Church* and *minister of religion*, he is enabled to convey *valid* authority

* Should it be objected that the above argument involves the position, that

to his various deputies as to men entrusted with a charge under God for the edification of his Church.

Men can, in consistency, have but *one* allegiance. The Jews evidently had but one, when they were favoured with kings zealous for the glory of God. But to divide it,—to hold an allegiance to an independent society, it may be hostile to the government, and which shall engross all the most powerful affections of the heart, and to reserve a separate and *inferior* allegiance to the government as no way connected with or concerned in the claims, objects and views of that society, is rending asunder what God for the wisest of purposes joined together in the Jewish Theocracy, and making a too dangerous experiment on human obliquity and infirmity. Religion should lead the heart to the government; and the government should so be conformed to the divine model as to be a proper object for so much of religious homage as is lawful to give to the Church of God. For kings and those in authority being *God's ministers* and not man's, we ought to regard them strictly as the peace officers, defenders, and protectors of the Church and of ourselves as members of her "*one body*." But instead of this Christian concord and obedience to the "powers that are ordained of God" what do we witness? Why truly it seems as if our energetic language were not strong enough to express the contempt in which some hold the government for being true to the Church and to the king's coronation oath; and the press is hoarse with the croakings of sectarian demagogues.

Christianity is but a new and improved, not a mutilated and in part suppressed edition of Judaism,—the ceremonial excepted, which is not essential but temporary and changeable. Hence the genius of the Gospel seeks after that same union of principle in government which went before it in living prophecy, and which only has power to embrace and secure to itself all lawful interests, and every variety of *laudable ambition*. A Christian subject, in regarding his prince as "the *minister of God*," ought to be able to associate him as such with his faith in Christ as a *Christian minister of God's justice*, appointed to promote the glory of God among men. He ought to be able to couple his allegiance with his faith, and pray for his sovereign in the same terms in which a Jew may be supposed to have prayed for David or Solomon, or Hezekiah, or Josiah, as the *shepherd of the nation*, under God, for the glory of his religion. But where religion is by the government *turked out of doors*, as it has been by the General Government of the United States, and where all the members of the Government may in perfect *political orthodoxy* be Turks, heathens, infidels or atheists, a prayer for the government as a *Christian government*, could never with propriety proceed out of the mouth of a single subject. Before the subject could pray for the State to promote the glory of God, he must pray that it may more definitely acknowledge his religion.

"No man can serve two masters: for either he will hate the one and love the other; or he will hold to the one, and despise the other. This truth is amply exemplified in the premises before us; and it fairly and rationally accounts for the malignant hatred which at different periods in British History has been entertained and manifested towards the Government on account of the Church, and the insidious machinations that have been resorted to by "*dissevered denominations*" to make her an object of scorn and contempt. Let those who are "*verily guilty*" in this matter see to it:—but let them restrain the *venomous out-breakings* of their ungodly ire;—let them cease to pour abroad the bitter "*waters of strife*" upon the land.* Let them reflect, that when the subjects of a

the Christian Ministry, by having power to crown the king, and invest him with the powers of his office, are superior to him, and not subject to his jurisdiction;—we reply: That when it is made to appear that the Jewish high priest, who anointed, crowned and proclaimed the king, (See I Kings i. 32. &c. and 2 Kings xi. 12,) in consequence thereof claimed sovereignty over him, then we will plead guilty to the charge.

* See the article, "*Ordination Service*," Sent. No. 16, p. 125, on "*the base columns*" of the *London World*: also *Christian Guardian*, vol. 2, No. 46, p. 364, from the *World*, with various other extracts and *Editorial* matter. We make not these remarks and references for the sake of controversy, but as appeals to *matters of fact* in support of our *defensive* arguments. Where the fundamental and *vital* principles of a *Christian Government* are